

Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00429 01 OF 02 291039Z

12

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

ACDE-00 /089 W

----- 031488

P R 290955Z SEP 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1199

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0429

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: PUBLIC AFFAIRS: OESER PRESS CONFERENCE QS AND AS,
SEPTEMBER 26, 1975

BEGIN SUMMARY: FOLLOWING READING OF PREPARED PRESS
STATEMENT (MBFR VIENNA 0427, DTG 271033Z SEP 75),
OESER FIELDDED A FEW WIDE-RANGING QUESTIONS. HE SIDE-
STEPPED ONE ON POTENTIAL NATO MOVES IN NUCLEAR FIELD BY
POINTING OUT THAT EASTERN REDUCTION PROPOSALS STILL ASK
FOR ACROSS-BOARD CUTS ON ALL WEAPONS, INCLUDING NUCLEAR
ONES. AT THE SAME TIME HE INDICATED THAT PACT SIDE WOULD
GIVE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO ALL FUTURE WESTERN PROPOSALS.

DURING A SUBSEQUENT RESPONSE HE SAID THAT THE EAST HAS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00429 01 OF 02 291039Z

EXPECTED A WESTERN MOVE SINCE "EARLY THIS YEAR", BUT THAT

HE SEES NOTHING NEW ON HORIZON NOW. OESER WAS MOST UNEQUIVOCAL IN ASSERTING THAT IT IS NOW THE UTURN OF THE ALLIES TO "UNDERTAKE SOMETHING", THAT "THE NEXT MOVE IS UP TO THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS."

END SUMMARY.

BEGIN TEXT:

1. Q. (FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU) HAVE NEW ELEMENTS EMERGED IN THIS NEGOTIATING ROUND, WHICH WOULD MAKE PROGRESS POSSIBLE?

A. GENERALLY WE DO NOT GIVE OUT INFORMATION ABOUT ALL THE DETAILS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. BUT AS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE AT THE START OF A ROUND, ONE DOES NOT IMMEDIATELY MOVE INTO NEW TERRITORY. YOU ARE OF COURSE AWARE OF OUR POSITION AS OUTLINED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PREVIOUS ROUND. WE HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTIVE IN OUR APPROACH; WE WILL CONTINUE TO BE CONSTRUCTIVE; NOTHING HAS CHANGED IN OUR POSITION. BUT OF COURSE, THESE NEGOTIATIONS ARE NOT A ONE-WAY STREET. WE DO HAVE THE RIGHT TO EXPECT FROM OUR PARTNERS THAT THEY WILL MAKE THEIR CONTRIBUTION.

2. Q. (EAST GERMAN RADIO) MR. AMBASSADOR, YOU SAID IN YOUR OPENING STATEMENT THAT THERE ARE THREE PRINCIPLES WHICH ARE OF THE GREATEST IMPORTANCE; THE FIRST PRINCIPLE IS THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS MUST PARTICIPATE IN THE REDUCTIONS FROM THE START. CAN YOU SAY MORE ABOUT THIS?

A. THE PREPARATORY AGREEMENTS WHICH I MENTIONED AT THE OUTSET PROVIDE THAT OUR NEGOTIATIONS ARE NEGOTIATIONS OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. HAVING THE SAME STATUS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, THEY HAVE THE SAME OBLIGATIONS FOR MAKING CONCRETE CONTRIBUTIONS. AND THE RESULTS OF THE HELSINKI CONFERENCE SHOW THAT COMPLEX ISSUES CAN BE SOLVED IF EVERYONE INVOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS MAKES THE PROPER CONTRIBUTION TO THE SOLUTIONS OF THESE ISSUES. WE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THE ARTIFICIAL TEARING APART OF THE TALKS, AS PROPOSED BY OUR PARTNERS, IS SOLELY AIMED AT CIRCUMVENTING LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00429 01 OF 02 291039Z

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THAT MAKES PROGRESS IN THE TALKS DIFFICULT. IT IS ONLY NATURAL THAT EVERY PARTICIPANT WHO TAKES ON SUBSTANTIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THE REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS MUST KNOW WHAT THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS INTEND TO UNDERTAKE, AT WHAT TIME, AND IN WHICH DIMENSION. SUCH AN APPROACH IS JUST. I MIGHT REMIND YOU THAT IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND DESPITE THE FACT THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS HAVE THE SAME

STATUS AND THE SAME OBLIGATIONS, WE HAVE AGREED TO MAKE CHANGES AND SUPPLEMENTS IN OUR DRAFT PROPOSAL SO THAT THE USSR AND THE US WOULD AT EACH OF THE TWO INITIAL REDUCTION STAGES CARRY OUT THEIR REDUCTIONS FIRST. I BELIEVE THAT THIS SHOWS THAT IT IS NOW HIGH TIME FOR THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS TO MAKE A COMMENSURATE MATCHING MOVE WHICH WOULD GIVE THE ASSURANCE THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL MAKE THEIR JUST CONTRIBUTION TO REDUCTION.

3. Q. (NEUE ZEIT) MR. AMBASSADOR, YOU CRITICIZED THE NATO PROPOSAL TO SPLIT THE NEGOTIATIONS INTO TWO PHASES, AND SAY THAT THIS IS INTENDED TO CIRCUMVENT EVENTUAL AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED. BUT YOU OBVIOUSLY ALSO ARE AWARE THAT THE WESTERN STATES HAVE GIVEN FIRM ASSURANCES THAT IN THE SECOND PHASE ALL COUNTRIES WILL COMMIT THEMSELVES TO MAKING REDUCTIONS - THEY WILL TAKE ON THESE OBLIGATIONS IN PHASE I. DON'T YOU TRUST THIS COMMITMENT?

A. WE USE A PROVERB AT HOME: TRUST IS ALL RIGHT - CONTROL IS BETTER. (COMMENT: THAT PROVERB IS STRAIGHT OUT OF LENIN.) OF COURSE, IN SUCH NEGOTIATIONS WE MUST PUT OUR TRUST IN MANY THINGS. BUT IT IS QUITE OBVIOUS THAT WE MUST HAVE MORE THAN THAT. YOU KNOW THE STORY OF THE SECOND PHASE: IT DOES NOT MENTION WHEN THESE REDUCTIONS WILL TAKE PLACE, NOR WHICH FORCES AND ARMAMENTS OF WHAT COUNTRY WILL BE INVOLVED. THESE COMMITMENTS ARE NOTHING MORE THAN AN ASSERTION THAT THERE IS A READINESS, AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF PHASE I -- WHICH PROVIDES UNEQUAL REDUCTIONS FOR SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES -- TO ENTER INTO NEW NEGOTIATIONS. EVEN IF I ASSUME THAT MY PARTNER HAS THE BEST INTENTIONS, THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT I WILL COME TO AN AGREEMENT WITH HIM ON THAT MATTER. SO WHAT WE HAVE IS VERY LITTLE. WE CANNOT REGARD THIS AS A CONCRETE COMMITMENT.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00429 01 OF 02 291039Z

I BELIEVE OUR STAND IS JUSTIFIED AND RESTS ON SOLID GROUND, NAMELY THAT ALL MUST DELCARE CONCRETELY WHICH FORCES AND ARMAMENTS THEY WILL REDUCE.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00429 02 OF 02 291052Z

12

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

ACDE-00 /089 W

----- 031574

P R 290955Z SEP 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1200

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0429

FROM US REP MBFR

4. Q. (NEUE ZUERCHER) THERE HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS REPORTS THAT THE US IS PREPARED TO MAKE GOOD THIS DEFICIT WHICH YOU HAVE MENTIONED BY INTRODUCING NUCLEAR WEAPONS. (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION ALONG LINES INQUIRING WHETHER SUCH A COMPENSATION WOULD NOT RECTIFY FORCE INEQUALITY, BY FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU) IN CASE THIS QUESTION COMES UP FOR DISCUSSION, WOULD IT BE CONCEIVABLE THAT THE WARSAW PACT STATES WOULD THEN TAKE ANOTHER APPROACH TO THE ASYMMETRIC REDUCTION OF GROUND FORCES?

A. FIRST OF ALL, OUR POSITION ON THE QUESTION OF REDUCTIONS, INCLUDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS, IS WELL KNOWN. IT HAS NOT CHANGED - WE ARE FOR THE REDUCTION OF GROUND AND AIR FORCES, INCLUDING FORCES WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS. YOU ARE AWARE OF THAT. EVERYTHING THAT TENDS TO MOVE IN THAT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00429 02 OF 02 291052Z

DIRECTION, EVERYTHING THAT LEADS TO THE REDUCTIONS OF THE WHOLE SPECTRUM OF FORCES AND WEAPONS, WILL BE EXAMINED VERY CAREFULLY BY US. OF COURSE, I ALSO READ NEWSPAPERS, AND I OBVIOUSLY PICK UP THINGS HERE AND THERE. BUT AS FAR AS SUCH AN APPROACH IS CONCERNED, I AM NOT NOW

AWARE OF ANY CONCRETE MEASURES. AND IT WILL ALWAYS DEPEND ON HOW SUCH A PROPOSAL IS FORMULATED. WE ARE INTERESTED IN PROPOSALS WHICH CONSTITUTE STEPS DESIGNED TO MOVE THE TALKS AHEAD. WE HAVE A FLEXIBLE POSITION, BECAUSE THIS IS A COMPLEX SUBJECT MATTER, AND IT ENCOMPASSES ALL ELEMENTS; IT THEREFORE AFFORDS US AN AREA FOR MANEUVERING AND IT PERMITS US TO JUDGE THE SITUATION BY TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF THE FORCES IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING PERSONNEL, THEIR ARMS, THEIR COMBAT EQUIPMENT, ETC. WHICH MEANS THAT YOU MAY BE SURE THAT WE WILL HAVE A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH TO ALL ASPECTS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. AS CONCERNS THE SECOND PART OF THE QUESTION, I AM NOT CERTAIN THAT I SEE ANY CONNECTION. I AM OF THE OPINION THAT ONE SHOULD CLEARLY STATE, AS I HAVE DONE IN MY STATEMENT, THAT THE EXISTING FORCE RELATIONSHIP IS STABLE, THAT IT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO MAINTAINING THE PEACE. NOBODY SHOULD ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THIS UNILATERALLY IN HIS FAVOR. THAT SHOULD BE QUITE CLEAR, BECAUSE THAT IS THE BASIS FOR ARRIVING AT A JUST SETTLEMENT, NAMELY THAT THE SECURITY OF NONE OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES IS TO BE CHANGED OR REDUCED. AND THAT IS NOT JUST IN THE INTEREST OF THOSE DIRECTLY CONCERNED; IT IS ALSO IN THE INTEREST OF ALL THE PARTICIPANTS.

5. Q. BASED ON WHAT YOU HAVE SAID HERE, CAN WE ASSUME THE EAST HAS NO INTENTION OF MAKING A NEW PROPOSAL?

A. THE WAY YOUR QUESTION IS PHRASED NO DIPLOMAT COULD RESPOND TO IT. BUT THAT IS NOT DIRECTED AGAINST YOU. I CAN UNDERSTAND WHY YOU WOULD ASK SUCH A QUESTION.

6. Q. (GUARDIAN) PERHAPS I COULD PHRASE IT DIFFERENTLY. COULD IT BE EXPECTED THAT YOU WILL MAKE NEW PROPOSALS?

A. I HAVE STATED AT THE OUTSET, AND I DO NOT INTEND TO ADD ANYTHING TO THAT FORMULATION, NAMELY THAT WE HAVE MADE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00429 02 OF 02 291052Z

PROPOSALS AND THAT THESE PROPOSALS HAVE SHOWN THAT WE HAVE MADE A CONSIDERABLE EFFORT TO MEET THE VIEWS OF OUR PARTNERS. WE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THE SITUATION IS SUCH THAT NOW THEY HAVE TO UNDERTAKE SOMETHING. THAT IS PART OF THE AGENDA. BUT OUR ATTITUDE IS A CONSTRUCTIVE ONE, AND THERE ARE NO NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH, OVER THE LONG HAUL, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE RESULTS IF ONLY ONE SIDE MAKES PROPOSALS. BUT THE NEXT MOVE IS UP TO THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS.

7. Q. (VOA) I TAKE IT, MR AMBASSADOR, THAT YOU EXPECT NEW PROPOSALS TO BE MADE BY THE WESTERN SIDE. WHEN

SHOULD THAT TAKE PLACE?

A. WE HAVE BEEN EXPECTING THEM AT LEAST SINCE THE START OF THIS YEAR. AT LEAST I HAVE BEEN READING ABOUT THIS IN THE PAPERS SINCE THEN, NAMELY THE FACT THAT THOUGHT IS BEING GIVEN TO THAT. BUT I CAN TELL YOU QUITE HONESTLY THAT THE POSITIONS TAKEN ON BASIC QUESTIONS (BY THE WESTERN SIDE) ARE DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED TO THE AGREED PRINCIPLES (OF THE NEGOTIATIONS). AND ON THIS POINT THERE HAS UNFORTUNATELY BEEN NO MOVEMENT. AFTER THE BASIC PRINCIPLES HAVE BEEN WORKED OUT WITH DIFFICULTY AND GREAT CARE, WE TEND TO APPROACH THESE PRINCIPLES VERY CAREFULLY.

8. Q. (FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU) THE WESTERN SIDE STARTS FROM THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE MAINTAINANCE OF THE BALANCE OF FORCES IS OF THE ESSENCE. BUT YOU YOURSELF HAVE SAID HERE THAT YOU HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING THE PAPERS, AND YOU MUST THEREFORE HAVE ALSO READ THAT RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUALS HAVE MAINTAINED THAT THIS FORCE RELATIONSHIP HAS STRONGLY SHIFTED IN FAVOR OF THE EASTERN SIDE SINCE THE NEGOTIATIONS STARTED. WOULD YOU WANT TO COMMENT ON THAT?

A. I WOULD HAVE TO RETURN TO SOMETHING THAT I SAID IN THIS VERY PLACE ABOUT A YEAR AGO. WE HAVE TOLD OUR PARTNERS THAT WE ARE PREPARED TO ACCEPT OBLIGATIONS IN OUR PROPOSALS TO REDUCE NUMBERS AND ARMAMENTS OF THE FORCES OF THE DIRECTLY INVOLVED STATES. WHEN THIS TURNED OUT TO BE DIFFICULT, WE THEN MADE THE MORE LIMITED PROPOSAL OF A FIRST STEP, AND FINALLY WE PROPOSED A JOINT DECLARATION LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00429 02 OF 02 291052Z

NOT TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF COMBAT FORCES. THIS TESTIFIES TO OUR READINESS TO ACCEPT CONCRETE OBLIGATIONS, AND THESE PROPOSALS ARE STILL VALID. THAT IS A FACTUAL RESPONSE TO YOUR QUESTION. (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION: BUT THIS PROPOSAL IS NOT VALID AS LONG AS THERE HAVE BEEN NO AGREEMENTS MADE.) I EXPECTED THIS FOLLOW-UP QUESTION. BUT YOU MUST ALSO BE ACQUAINTED WITH OTHER FACTS. FACTS WHICH POINT TO AN EXPANSION OF ARMED FORCES ON THE WESTERN SIDE: FOR INSTANCE IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT THE AMERICAN FORCES WOULD COMPENSATE FOR AN INCREASE IN COMBAT FORCES WITH A REDUCTION OF SUPPORT TROOPS. IN THE MEANTIME THERE HAS BEEN A CHANGE IN THIS, AND AS A RESULT THERE WILL BE MORE TROOPS IN EUROPE. YOU ARE ALSO AWARE THAT THE BUNDESWEHR HAS SET UP THREE ADDITIONAL BRIGADES, AND THAT IT IS CONSIDERING A REORGANIZATION. THIS WOULD SEEM TO POINT UP HOW TIMELY OUR PROPOSAL ABOUT MAKING JOINT DECLARATIONS NOT TO INCREASE THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES IS. WE ARE READY TO ACCEPT SUCH AN OBLIGATION IMMEDIATELY. END TEXT.RESOR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DETENTE, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, PRESS CONFERENCES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 29 SEP 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00429
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750336-0866
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t1975096/aaaaaeoj.tel
Line Count: 330
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <22 OCT 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: PUBLIC AFFAIRS: OESER PRESS CONFERENCE QS AND AS, SEPTEMBER 26, 1975
TAGS: PARM, PFOR, NATO, WTO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006